

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 05/12/2006

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/814,810	03/31/2004	Randall W. Davis	10143	5294	
27015	7590 05/12/2006	EXAMINER			
CHARLES LOUIS THOEMING			CROW, ROBERT THOMAS		
1390 WILLOW PASS ROAD, SUITE 1020 CONCORD, CA 94520		1020	ART UNIT PAPE		
,			1634		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application I	10.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/814,810		DAVIS, RANDALL W.				
		Examiner		Art Unit				
		Robert T. Cro	w	1634				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communica or Reply	tion appears on the co	ver sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	ldress			
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAIL asions of time may be available under the provisions of 3 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this community openiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statute or to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, eply received by the Office later than three months after ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	LING DATE OF THIS 17 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, I cation. bry period will apply and will ex , by statute, cause the applicati	COMMUNICATION however, may a reply be tim pire SIX (6) MONTHS from on to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this c D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	,			
Status								
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed of	on						
·								
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	on of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-17</u> is/are pending in the application.								
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5)	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)□	Claim(s) is/are rejected.							
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-17</u> are subject to restriction	and/or election requir	ement.					
Applicat	on Papers							
9)[The specification is objected to by the E	xaminer.						
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐	objected to by the f	Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority (ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).								
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:								
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.							
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage							
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).								
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.								
Attachmen	t(s)							
	te of References Cited (PTO-892)		Interview Summary					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)					O-152)			
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:								

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 1-15, drawn to an apparatus for substrate cleansing, classified in class 435, subclass 287.1.
- II. Claims 16 and 17, drawn to a method for isolation of unreactive bioreactive material and substrate cleansing, classified in class 435, subclass 6.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the apparatus of Invention I can be used to spray a coating on a substrate.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter as exemplified by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper. Furthermore, a search for the inventions of all of the groups would

Art Unit: 1634

not be co-extensive because a search indicating the *process is* novel or nonobvious would not extend to a holding that the *product itself is* novel or nonobvious; similarly, a search indicating that *the product is* known or would have been obvious would not extend to a holding that *the process is* known or would have been obvious.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312. In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the

Art Unit: 1634

requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert T. Crow whose telephone number is (571) 272-1113. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ram Shukla can be reached on (571) 272-0735. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/814,810 Page 5

Art Unit: 1634

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Robert T. Crow Examiner Art Unit 1634

Malle 5/9/06

BJ FORMAN, PH.D. PRIMARY EXAMINER